

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicants request favorable reconsideration of the above-identified application.

Claims 1-8, 15, and 16 are now pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 15 being independent. By this Amendment, Applicants have canceled Claims 9-14 and amended Claims 15 and 16. No new matter has been added.

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). In particular, the Office Action lists various elements for which the Examiner has questions as to where the element is depicted. Applicants submit that the elements are depicted in the figures. The components of an example Stokes meter are depicted Fig. 1. Specifically, Fig. 1 depicts dividing units 107, 108; single-light-beam type Glan-Thompson polarization prism 112, 115; dual-light-beam type Glan-Thompson polarization prism 109; light receiving portions 110, 111, 113, and 116; and calculating means 117. Applicants submit that these features form an adequate depiction of a Stokes meter. Furthermore, the specification, at page 27, line 20, through page 28, line 1, indicates that polarization analyzer 507 shown in Fig. 5 corresponds to a Stokes meter.

With respect to the light projecting unit, Applicants note that Fig. 1 shows a light source 101; single-light-beam type Glan-Thompson polarization prism 102; and quarter phase difference plate 103. Applicants submit that these features adequately depict an example of a light projecting unit.

With respect to light receiving portions, Fig. 1 depicts light receiving portions 110, 111, 113, and 116, for example.

With respect to the objections concerning method Claims 15 and 16, the claimed steps are inherently shown through the functional relationships of the elements of Fig. 1. In particular, in Fig. 1, circularly polarized light is projected to sample 105 by means of light source 101, single-light-beam type Glan-Thompson polarization prism 102 and quarter phase difference plate 103. This functional relationship is discussed in the specification at page 10, lines 24-26. Further, the quantity of light from the sample 105 is detected by light receiving portions 110, 111, 113, and 116. The Stokes parameter is determined by calculating means 117. This functional relationship is discussed on page 12, lines 5-9, of the specification. In addition, the birefringence is determined by calculating means 117 on the basis of the determined Stokes parameter, as discussed in the specification at page 19, lines 7-9.

Consequently, Applicants submit that the claim features are adequately depicted in the figures and request withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.


Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,266,141 (Morita). Claim 9 has been cancelled to expedite prosecution.

With the cancellation of Claim 9, the remaining claims pending in this application are all indicated as being allowable. Consequently, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request notice thereof.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Justin J. Oliver", is written over a horizontal line.

Justin J. Oliver
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,986

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

JJO/tmm/gmc

DC_MAIN 258461v1